



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,330	07/30/2001	Mark A. Kirkpatrick	BS01-084	9174
45695	7590	08/07/2006	EXAMINER	
WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH P. O. BOX 71355 MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355			NAWAZ, ASAD M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/916,330

Applicant(s)

KIRKPATRICK ET AL.

Examiner

Asad M. Nawaz

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/2/06, 4/14/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 5/9/06. Claims 6, 7, 15, 16, 25, 36, 37, and 40 were amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1-41 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (USPN 5813017) further in view of Adamchick (USPN 5761668).

As to claim 1, Morris teaches a client-server computer system comprising:
a client application server that utilizes data in a particular form and generates a validation request for validation of the data and wherein the request includes the data in an initial form, an application server accessible by a plurality of client application servers via a plurality of application software protocols, wherein said application server provides a data validation service on the data received from the client application server in response to receiving the validation request from the client application server (abstract; col 6, lines 50-67) wherein the data validation service compares the data in the initial

form to a reference for the particular form utilized by the client application to determine whether the initial form matches the particular form and returns to the same client application server that generated the validation request an indication of valid or invalid based on whether the initial form matches the particular form (abstract; col 6, lines 35-39; col 6, lines 50-67; delta difference file) and a storage mass coupled to said application server for storing a system of dynamically maintainable validation functions for performing said validation service (col 8, lines 43-59; backup servers and etc.).

However, Morris does not explicitly indicate wherein the validation includes checking whether a date specified in the data is in a valid format based on the number of digits that represent the year and further includes checking whether the date falls within a set range of dates.

Adamchick teaches the above-mentioned limitation by checking the format of the year and determining if the day is approaching the turn of a century (see abstract; col 4, lines 39-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Adamchick into those of Morris to allow the system to be standardized. Allowing the system to be standardized would allow the system to check the validity of the date and whether the request is even essential (by not falling into a set range of dates) thereby saving essential resources.

As to claim 2, Morris teaches a client-server computer system according to claim wherein said storage mass comprises a database (Fig 1, numerals 12 and 15; Fig 2, numerals 25-29)

As to claim 4 Morris and Adamchick teach a client-server computer system according to claim 2, wherein said database contains a table-based system of rules organized into at least three hierarchically-organized views. (Fig 2, numerals 25-29; col 9, lines 1-12)

As to claim 6, Morris and Adamchick teach a client-server computer system according to claim 2, wherein said database stores validation functions stored ms hierarchically-organized views that are dynamically updatable by an external administrator (Fig 2, numerals 25-29; col 9, lines 1-12).

As to claim 8, Morris and Adamchick teach a client-server computer system according to claim 4, wherein said application server and said database are centrally located to said plurality of client application servers and said validation functions are maintainable by a remote administrator. (col 8, line 60 to col 9, line 12)

Claims 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are essentially the method, application server, system and method for the above-mentioned claims and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 33, 35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (USPN 5813017) further in view of Official Notice.

As to claims 3, 5, 7, and 9, Morris teaches the method of claim 1 with validation functions represented by a storage schema maintainable by a remote administrator, a database containing a table-based system of rules organized into at least three

hierarchically-organized views, wherein the storage schema is located centrally.

However, Morris does not explicitly indicate that the schema is represented via LDAP.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use LDAP in a system as taught by Morris because LDAP is a standardized networking protocol designed for querying and modifying directory services. The IETF designed and specified LDAP as a better way to make use of directories having found DAP to be too complex for simple Internet clients to use.

Claims 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 33, 35, and 39 contain similar limitations as the above-mentioned claims and are thus rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In substance the applicant argues that A) Morris does not disclose a process of validation by returning to the same client application server that generated the validation request an indication of "valid" or "invalid" format based on whether the initial form matches the particular form using dynamically maintained validation functions and B) Adamchick is non-analogous art.

In response to A), the claims are broad and thus interpreted as such. It should be noted that the claims recitation of initial form can be construed to be particular form as no distinction or exclusivity is stated. Nevertheless, Morris discloses that files are compared to determine whether the file has been modified. Upon the determination of change, a response is transmitted to the requesting client asking for the complete file to

be archived or not. This provides an indication of validity as unmodified files are returned and modified files are further inquired about (Abstract, Figs 2-4; col 6, lines 35-39; col 6, lines 50-67). Contrary to applicant's arguments, nowhere in the claim is it stated that the indication of validity is in a "valid" or "invalid" format. Claimed subject matter not the specification is the measure of the invention. Disclosure contained in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding prior art. In re Sporck, 55 CCPA 743, 386 F.2d 924, 155 USPQ 687 (1986); In re Self, 213 USPQ 1, 5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, 15 (CCPA 1978).

In response to B), In response to applicant's argument that Adamchick is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Morris teaches data validation by way of checking for modification. However, verifying the date as unchanged was not specifically mentioned. Adamchick was simply brought in to teach the feature of dates which is considered data within a file.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


AMN


PRIMARY EXAMINER